

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	The relationship between labour force satisfaction, wages and retention within the United Kingdom's National Health Service: a systematic review of the literature
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Bimpong, Kweku Andrew; Khan, Ausaf; Slight, Robert; Tolley, Clare; Slight, Sarah P.

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Deborah Ireson Edith Cowan University Perth Western Australia
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	07-Nov-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>As the manuscript stands it is loosely focused and it does not offer new argument to the topic of 'staff' retention or satisfaction, attention to language and presentation is recommended.</p> <p>The reviewer provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.</p>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Jill Manthorpe King's College London
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	10-Dec-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Thanks for this clearly written and informative review. It addresses a timely subject and the authors might link it to the development of the NHS People Plan. I liked the focus on the NHS rather than more general professional work.</p> <p>Table 1 usefully summarises some of the recommendations - I would suggest that the one under 'discrimination prevention' be reframed - it is not 'in spite of' background and circumstances but acknowledging that discrimination is unfair, wasteful, and that diversity reflects the patients we serve. Likewise 'image makeover' may be a bit superficial - surely it is about changing narratives.</p> <p>There are some points that might be addressed such as saying that the NHS is not just England but that much data and many studies are England focused. It is also the case that (at the time of writing) all UK citizens are nationals from the EU - so some attention to phrasing is needed here in the second para of the Introduction. On page 7 there is an incomplete sentence (near the mention of Storey et al). There is a suggestion that nurses and AHPs are tempted by agency work but the reference for this appears to be from an AHP study - maybe adding the King's Fund one here would help.</p> <p>The literature reviewed is sometimes quite old and I would suggest that this might be mentioned eg when talking about income (£70k in</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>2002 - Simoens - this is rather different today) the gap of nearly 20 years might be mentioned.</p> <p>Some attention is needed for the references, several are incomplete and dates are missing for quite a few. CQC needs to be in caps. The reference about nurses over 50 is incorrect (reference number 46) - the authors are Andrews et al and the journal is Journal of Advanced Nursing. Should that not be the reference for line 5 of page 10?</p> <p>Probably since this review was conducted there has been some acknowledgement of the importance of CPD - the authors might like to consult Moriarty, Steils et al (2019)<a href="https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/rapid-review-on-the-effectiveness-of-continuing-professional-development-in-the-health-sector(deb289ec-8bd2-47ab-96b5-e5f76b2cb07d).html">https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/rapid-review-on-the-effectiveness-of-continuing-professional-development-in-the-health-sector(deb289ec-8bd2-47ab-96b5-e5f76b2cb07d).html</a></p> <p>Overall, I think this is a good article but would recommend checking of references both citation but also their inclusion; some updating re policy initiatives (People Plan etc), and that the limits of the study be more crisply summarised. The authors end with a plea for more research - what might they suggest specifically?</p>
--	---

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

### Reviewer

#1

**As the manuscript stands it is loosely focused and it does not offer new argument to the topic of 'staff' retention or satisfaction, attention to language and presentation is recommended.**

We thank Reviewer 1 for their constructive feedback and have now revised the manuscript to ensure that it is more focused on staff retention and satisfaction within the NHS as opposed to staff in general. The review feeds into the work the NHS is currently undertaking to address staff retention by summarising the current evidence base and elucidating its gaps and potential avenues to pursue. We have also revised the language given recent changes e.g. the UK leaving the EU, and ensured that the review's presentation is consistent and clear.

### Reviewer

#2

#### **1. The authors might link it to the development of the NHS People Plan.**

We have now made reference to the Interim NHS People Plan as well as the more recent reports from the National Audit Office, the NHS Workforce Race Equality Standard and the NHS Pay Review Board.

#### **2. Table 1 usefully summarises some of the recommendations - I would suggest that the one under 'discrimination prevention' be reframed - it is not 'in spite of' background and circumstances but acknowledging that discrimination is unfair, wasteful, and that diversity reflects the patients we serve.**

We have now reframed the recommendation under 'discrimination prevention' and acknowledge how discrimination is unfair and an inclusive culture is needed within the NHS.

3. **Likewise 'image makeover' may be a bit superficial - surely it is about changing narratives.**

We have now updated the phrase 'image makeover' to 'improving the narrative', as requested, and expanded on our recommendation.

4. **There are some points that might be addressed such as saying that the NHS is not just England but that much data and many studies are England focused.**

We have now addressed this in the last paragraph in the discussion, and expanded on this point to provide clarity for international readers.

5. **It is also the case that (at the time of writing) all UK citizens are nationals from the EU - so some attention to phrasing is needed here in the second para of the Introduction.**

We have now updated the introduction, with the UK having now left the EU, and phrased this in the introduction.

6. **On page 7, there is an incomplete sentence (near the mention of Storey et al).**

We have now addressed this and completed the sentence.

7. **There is a suggestion that nurses and AHPs are tempted by agency work but the reference for this appears to be from an AHP study - maybe adding the King's Fund one here would help.**

Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have now referenced the King's fund, as requested.

8. **The literature reviewed is sometimes quite old and I would suggest that this might be mentioned eg when talking about income (£70k in 2002 - Simoens - this is rather different today) the gap of nearly 20 years might be mentioned**

We have now updated the manuscript to reflect on how wages are likely to have changed over the years, when making reference to the figures quoted in past studies, as requested.

9. **Some attention is needed for the references, several are incomplete and dates are missing for quite a few.**

We have now rechecked all references to ensure they are complete and include dates.

10. **CQC needs to be in caps.**

We have now put CQC in capital letters.

11. The reference about nurses over 50 is incorrect (reference number 46) - the authors are Andrews et al and the journal is Journal of Advanced Nursing. Should that not be the reference for line 5 of page 10?

We have now double checked our references and corrected any inaccuracies.

12. Probably since this review was conducted there has been some acknowledgement of the importance of CPD - the authors might like to consult Moriarty, Steils et al (2019)[https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/rapid-review-on-the-effectiveness-of-continuing-professional-development-in-the-health-sector\(deb289ec-8bd2-47ab-96b5-e5f76b2cb07d\).html](https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/rapid-review-on-the-effectiveness-of-continuing-professional-development-in-the-health-sector(deb289ec-8bd2-47ab-96b5-e5f76b2cb07d).html)

Thank you for your helpful suggestion. We have now acknowledged the importance of CPD and included this specific reference in our manuscript.

13. Overall, I think this is a good article but would recommend checking of references both citation but also their inclusion; some updating re policy initiatives (People Plan etc), and that the limits of the study be more crisply summarised.

We have now double checked all references and can confirm that they are correct. We have now referenced the People Plan and other recent policy developments such as the spending review. We have also summarised more succinctly the limits of our study, as requested.

14. The authors end with a plea for more research - what might they suggest specifically?

We have now included further details on future research in the Discussion section, as requested.

The opportunity to respond to this constructive feedback has, we believe, helped us improve our manuscript, and for this we are grateful. Our revised contribution will, we anticipate, be of widespread interest to The BMJ Open's broad international readership. We believe that we have responded to each of the points made, as requested, and trust that the resulting revisions are to your satisfaction. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information or clarification.

## VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Jill Manthorpe King's College London
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Feb-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for these amendments and clarifications. I think that these are appropriate and that this will be a valuable addition to researchers and HR professionals, especially as the NHS People Plan will be out shortly.